

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action of May 29, 2009. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections of the Examiner. Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

The present claim amendments are clarifications intended to more precisely set forth the present invention. Support for the present claim amendments is found throughout the Specification and Drawings as originally filed. For example, support for the present claim amendments is found in Figs. 6A and 6B, and from lines 13-29 on page 17 of the Specification as originally filed.

No new matter has been added.

Claims 3-5, 9, 13-16 and 19 stand rejected for non-statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. Amendments to the claims herein are respectfully to meet all requirements in this regard.

Claims 3-5, 9, 13-16 and 19-38 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on the combination of U.S. patent 6,792,145 ("Gay"), U.S. patent 5,903,646 ("Rackman"), U.S. patent application publication 2004/0205535 ("Newman et al."), and U.S. patent 6,330,589 ("Kennedy"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Gay discloses extracting textual as well as tabular data material from a financial document, and a comparison made to determine the type of data schedule material provided in the document. Subsequently, Gay compares the character strings of the financial document to character strings provided in previous documents or in various databases. The database of the previous document in Gay includes the textual material in a first plane, and the tabular material

also in that first plane. If a character string match is made between a new document and an old document, Gay teaches that the new tabular data material would be provided in a data matrix in a second plane but the corresponding textual material would not be included in the textual matrix provided in that second plane.

Rackman discloses an access control system for litigation document production. Documents in Rackman are produced as stored images on an optical disk, and documents which are to be redacted or maintained confidential are stored in encrypted form. Rackman teaches that as the litigation progresses, access by the opposing counsel/party to additional documents can be effected by distributing appropriate decryption keys.

Newman et al. discloses a method for display of tree-structured information in a "treetable" that is a table-like display structure, in which each path from a root to a leaf node is represented by a single column, and cells representing the immediate successors of a node are placed immediately under that node. Variation in the amount of space given to cells within particular columns of the Newman et al. display structure is used to allow more detail to be given for selected paths and subtrees. Newman et al. further teach that extraction of subparts of a treetable into another such structure may be used for deeper exploration of trees.

Kennedy discloses a system for using a client database to manage conversation threads. In the Kennedy system, a news message threading scheme is converted to a conversation threading scheme that can be managed by a MAPI type of application. In the client database of Kennedy, the trees of Figs. 4a and 4b are converted to the MAPI format shown in Figs. 4c and 4d. Kennedy discloses that when a reference is detected to a message that has not yet been downloaded from a server to the client, a placeholder may be generated. See Fig. 11, and lines 14-27 in column 23. When the message placeholder of Kennedy is subsequently encountered, a

download operation is performed to download the message represented by the placeholder. See step 530 in Fig. 8.

Nowhere in the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy is there disclosed or suggested a method or system that includes:

...

... storing the shadow document in a computer usable memory, determining and visually rendering a complete tree *representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages responsive at least in part to the shadow document, wherein the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages graphically represents the original document as a child of the identified parent document and as a parent of the identified child document, and wherein after deleting of the original document the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages is preserved except with a modified graphical representation of the original document, wherein the modified graphical representation of the original document within the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages after deleting of the original document visually indicates that the original document has been deleted.* (emphasis added)

as, for example, in the present independent claim 3. In contrast, Gay teaches a technique for ensuring that a date of a document is valid from line 26 in column 27 through line 10 in column 8, Rackman describes counting pages in a document by determining the start of a scan of a new document in lines 15-46 in column 8, Newman et al. teach displaying a table-like “treetable” structure (Fig. 1), and Kennedy discloses entering placement holders into a client side database for messages that have not yet been downloaded, so that such messages can later be identified and downloaded (See Fig. 11 and Fig 8). Applicants respectfully note that Kennedy teaches away from tree representations, since a fundamental purpose of the Kennedy system is to convert tree structured information within the client database (Figs. 4a and 4b) into MAPI formatted data (Figs. 4c and 4d) for use by MAPI applications. Moreover, like Gay, Rackman, and Newman et

al., Kennedy is silent with regard to any way of preserving the display of deleted documents within a visually displayed tree message structure such that the deleted documents are graphically displayed in a way that indicates that they have been deleted. Kennedy describes deleting messages only with regard to default and leave on server modes of operation (column 8, lines 35-44) – neither of which provides any suggestion of any need to preserve a visual display of a tree structure including a modified graphical representation of a deleted message.

Applicants also respectfully urge that the present claims are not directed in whole or part to “nonfunctional descriptive material.” As set forth in MPEP 2106.01, “nonfunctional descriptive material” consists but is not limited to “music, literary works, and a compilation or mere arrangement of data”. Such a definition stands in contrast to the features of the present independent claims, which clearly impart functionality by their express terms, including through creating of the shadow document, storing of the shadow document, and representing a conversation thread of electronic mail messages responsive to the shadow document, wherein a visual rendering of the complete tree represents the conversation thread of electronic mail messages and graphically represents the original document as a child of the identified parent document and as a parent of the identified child document, and wherein after deleting of the original document the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages is preserved except with a modified graphical representation of the original document, wherein the modified graphical representation of the original document within the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages after deleting of the original document visually indicates that the original document has been deleted.

Accordingly, the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy does not disclose or suggest *visually rendering a complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages responsive at least in part to the shadow document, wherein the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages graphically represents the original document as a child of the identified parent document and as a parent of the identified child document, and wherein after deleting of the original document the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages is preserved except with a modified graphical representation of the original document, wherein the modified graphical representation of the original document within the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages after deleting of the original document visually indicates that the original document has been deleted*, as in the present independent claim 3.

It should be understood from the above discussion that the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy also does not disclose or suggest *visually rendering a complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages responsive at least in part to the shadow document, wherein the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages graphically represents the original document as a child of the identified parent document and as a parent of the identified child document, and wherein after deleting of the original document the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages is preserved except with a modified graphical representation of the original document, wherein the modified graphical representation of the original document within the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages after deleting of the*

original document visually indicates that the original document has been deleted, as in the present independent claim 9.

It should be understood from the above discussion that the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy also does not disclose or suggest *visually rendering a complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages responsive at least in part to the plurality of shadow documents, wherein the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages graphically represents the original document as a child of the identified parent document and as a parent of the identified child document, and wherein after deleting of the original document the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages is preserved except with a modified graphical representation of the original document, wherein the modified graphical representation of the original document within the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages after deleting of the original document visually indicates that the original document has been deleted, as in the present independent claim 19.*

It should be understood from the above discussion that the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy also does not disclose or suggest *visually rendering a complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages responsive at least in part to the shadow document, wherein the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages graphically represents the original document as a child of the identified parent document and as a parent of the identified child document, and wherein after deleting of the original document the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages is preserved*

except with a modified graphical representation of the original document, wherein the modified graphical representation of the original document within the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages after deleting of the original document visually indicates that the original document has been deleted, as in the present independent claim 21.

It should be understood from the above discussion that the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy also does not disclose or suggest *visually rendering a complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages responsive at least in part to the shadow document, wherein the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages graphically represents the original document as a child of the identified parent document and as a parent of the identified child document, and wherein after deleting of the original document the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages is preserved except with a modified graphical representation of the original document, wherein the modified graphical representation of the original document within the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages after deleting of the original document visually indicates that the original document has been deleted, as in the present independent claim 24.*

It should be understood from the above discussion that the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy also does not disclose or suggest *visually rendering a complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages responsive at least in part to the plurality of shadow documents, wherein the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages graphically represents the*

received original document as a child of the identified parent document and as a parent of the identified child document, and wherein after deleting of the received original document the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages is preserved except with a modified graphical representation of the received original document, wherein the modified graphical representation of the received original document within the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages after deleting of the received original document visually indicates that the received original document has been deleted, as in the present independent claim 29.

It should be understood from the above discussion that the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy also does not disclose or suggest *visually rendering a complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages responsive at least in part to the shadow document, wherein the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages graphically represents the original document as a child of the identified parent document and as a parent of the identified child document, and wherein after deleting of the original document the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages is preserved except with a modified graphical representation of the original document, wherein the modified graphical representation of the original document within the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages after deleting of the original document visually indicates that the original document has been deleted, as in the present independent claim 30.*

It should be understood from the above discussion that the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy also does not disclose or suggest *visually rendering a*

complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages responsive at least in part to the shadow document, wherein the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages graphically represents the original document as a child of the identified parent document and as a parent of the identified child document, and wherein after deleting ~~fo~~of the original document the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages is preserved except with a modified graphical representation of the original document, wherein the modified graphical representation of the original document within the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages after deleting of the original document visually indicates that the original document has been deleted, as in the present independent claim 33.

It should be understood from the above discussion that the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy also does not disclose or suggest *visually rendering a complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages responsive at least in part to the plurality of shadow documents, wherein the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages graphically represents the received original document as a child of the identified parent document and as a parent of the identified child document, and wherein after deleting of the received original document the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of electronic mail messages is preserved except with a modified graphical representation of the received original document, wherein the modified graphical representation of the received original document within the visual rendering of the complete tree representing the conversation thread of*

electronic mail messages after deleting of the original document visually indicates that the received original document has been deleted, as in the present independent claim 38.

For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully urge that the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy does not disclose all the features of independent claims 3, 9, 19, 21, 24, 29, 30, 33 and 38. Accordingly, Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy do not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to the present independent claims. As to the remaining claims, they each depend from the previously discussed independent claims, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Gay, Rackman, Newman et al. and Kennedy for at least the same reasons.

Reconsideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended claims herein. However, Applicants are not conceding in this application that unamended claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the unamended claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney at 617-630-1131 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

November 27, 2009
Date

/David Dagg/
David Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
44 Chapin Road
Newton, MA 02459
(617) 630-1131

Docket No. 260-137